

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action dated December 29, 2003. It was assumed during preparation of this Response that the Examiner intended Figures 1, 2 and 4 to be a single species, Figure 26 to be a single species, Figure 27 to be a single species, etc. This interpretation of the Examiner's division of species is believed consistent with the prior claim restriction. In response to the instant restriction requirement, Applicants elect the species of Figures 1, 2 and 4, with traverse. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 21-23, 27-33, 35, 36, 39-54 and 56-60 are believed to read upon the elected species.

The requirement for restriction is traversed because the Examiner's grouping of species is believed improper. More specifically, the species of Figures 5 and 6 and the species of Figure 9 are detail views of the same console shown in elected Figures 1, 2 and 4, as is evidenced by the usage of the same reference numbers which appear in all of these figures as well as by the description in the specification beginning on page 10, line 32. Additional views of this same console are shown in Figures 7-11. Figure 9 is a cross-sectional view of Figure 5 as indicated by the section line 9-9 in Figure 5, and shows the console without the opposed screens 134 thereon. The bottom plate 165 shown in Figure 9 which may be the cause of the Examiner's confusion is not visible in Figure 5, but is visible in Figures 6-8, 10 and 11.

Further, it is submitted that the raceway shown in Figure 12 (which was designated as a separate species by the Examiner) is a detail view of the raceway shown in elected Figures 1, 2 and 4, as evidenced by the common reference numerals in Figures 1, 2, 4 and 12, and the description in the specification which begins on page 24, line 8. Additional views of this same raceway are shown in Figures 13-19.

In view of the above, it is submitted that Figures 5-11 pertaining to the console and Figures 12-19 pertaining to the raceway should be grouped with the elected species of Figures

1, 2 and 4. Accordingly, the dependent claims indicated as reading upon the elected species above pertain to the worksurface, console and raceway shown in elected Figures 1, 2 and 4.

Claims 61-63 are added herein and are also believed to read upon the elected species of Figures 1, 2 and 4. Independent Claim 61 is directed to a workstation arrangement including a worksurface, a console and a raceway as shown in elected Figures 1, 2 and 4. It is submitted that the above is consistent with the prior claim restriction and the election of the Group II claims, wherein the Examiner included dependent Claim 21 (which introduces an elongate conduit having a terminal end mounted to the console) in Group II.

An action on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Liane L. Churney

LLC/cc

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL
& TANIS, P.C.
2026 Rambling Road
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1631
Phone: (269) 381-1156
Fax: (269) 381-5465

Dale H. Thiel	Reg. No. 24	323
David G. Boutell	Reg. No. 25	072
Ronald J. Tanis	Reg. No. 22	724
Terryence F. Chapman	Reg. No. 32	549
Mark L. Maki	Reg. No. 36	589
Liane L. Churney	Reg. No. 40	694
Brian R. Tumm	Reg. No. 36	328
Steven R. Thiel	Reg. No. 53	685
Sidney B. Williams, Jr.	Reg. No. 24	949

Encl: Post Card

136.0703